Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
9/26/75

Mr. Bob Kelley
Church Intelligence Committee
Senate Office Bldg.
Wash.,D.C. 20510

Dear Bob,

If your note of the 23rd and enclosures (thanks) had not come today I would have written you anyway. I've delayed it since Monday in order not to feel the pressure of the work I've been engaged on until I got to a point where I could stop.

I've been working as long and as hard as possible to get Post Mortem ready ro print. I have made the arrangements for the printing and for some ancillary uses, one of the reasons for writing. The major problems now are getting the cover done and completing the index, which will determine how many more documents I can reproduce in facsimile in the appendix. (There will be more than 150 pages of them all of which you and the Members will find to be new, I'm sure.)

Then there was Senator Church's about-face reported in the Post of the 23rd, one that both pleases and worries me. And the adoption of the Schweiker resolution and appointing of that subcommittee. This presents what I regard as a new set of problems for which I'll take a little time.

What pleases me about the Church statement is its focus. I believe I am alone along those generally called "critics" in having taken this approach in all of my work and when some in the House asked me for a position paper. I personally encouraged Tiny Hutton and Rick Feeney to ask Downing to amend his resolution to this focus during the summer. I believe it is the correct approach and one that aside from having a clear legislative purpose is the one that can eliminate the courtroom delays some witnesses and their principals would try to arrange.

What worries me is whether the present life of this committee makes any real investigation possible and whether the chairman may have personal plans that would prevent extending the present committee.

Here I must be blunt and I do hope you will not misunderstand it and will ask any questions if you or Mac have them.

Complicated as your present investigation is, it may turn out to be simple compared with what a proper domestic-assassination investigation might well involved. The truth is so Byzantine it is hard to conceive. One simplification I ask you to accept is that those you will be investigating began their preparations for the coming apart of the whole fabricated fiction called an investigation before the Warren Commission had really gotten started. As one example of this I can put in your hands a document in which pretty clearly Hoover was setting the CIA up for more than its share of responsibility. Another is testimony that passed the FBI's responsibilities off onto the Commission (testimony in the plural). Another simplification is that there never was and never was intended to be any real investigation. By anybody, including two Presidents, LBJ and Ford, and the federal investigative agencies.

On the "critics" side I must also be blunt and this will include some with whom I believe Mac has a friendly relationship. Most of these, especially those who are best known and have been most active on the Hill, really do not know the subject, are engaged in what is largely self-promotion, and have already misled some Members. Their judgement, without exception, has been terrible and they have just about all engaged in clearly unethical things. They present a distinct hazard to

any investigation, including the Members. I have been part of and know how investigations work. The larger the staff the greater the compartmenting and the greater this danger. Moreover, these are all not only vulnerable people but those on whom these agencies that are to be investigated have long and complete records. (I have copies of some of what can be used to hurt the investigation and Members of these associations.)

The most respect of these people have done and said the most insane things. Of some this is the kindest representation. Then there is the multitude widely but not entirely recognized as nuts. Your committee has given attention to some, at least on the staff level. Some of the Members are talking to others, to my knowledge. I've already had approaches for my own work from this. I've deferred them.

I want this investigation very much. But I also want it to be responsible and to succeed. Unless there is the certainty that your commitee can and will be continued as long as is necessary for a very difficult and painful job I do not think it should even think seriously of going farthur than I suggested to you, taking a look and finding enough to justify recommending a separate investigation. I have put more than this much by far together. What I showed you was no more than enough to capture your attention and given you an idea of the kind of documentation I have.

If I restrict myself to this it is not because I do not believe I have done more. I really believe I have laid as complete a basis as possible for such an investigation and have in hand pretty much of what it can hope to establish.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind what the results can be as there is none about what the hazards are. There can be some political liability for Members in this but on balance there will be an enormous political benefit. I would, as I told you long ago, prefer that this be Mac's. This is one of the reasons I hope he can find time in what is always a busy life so we can talk about this much more than we did before he went abroad.

Time is growing short for me. In as little as two weeks and most likely not more than three there will be some use of some of this material. If I had not been able to arrange this I would not have been able to pay the printer without extending my debt, unwise at my age and in my financial condition. At that time there will be no time for the making of any arrangements. Enough of this work will be out and were I to try to limit its use I would not be able to. If I may not have thought of all possible angles I believe I have considered more than anyone else and quite likely more and other than will occur to most people, Members and others, once this is out. I can, for example, see distinct benefit to Mac even if he does not want to be part of any such investigation and if this were to be his course no liability at all.

Much as I would welcome the advantages it could hold for my continuing work my motive in this is not personal. The proposal I made to you I think you will recall is an unselfish one. While I think Mac knows me well enough to be willing to assume this I can show him and you my written refusal to be on the coming CBS special after agreeing to on a question of basic principle.

So, I remind you that my time is controlled by the appearance of this part of my work in a mass-circulation publication and perhaps more by andy advance publicity they may give it as it is by the approaches to me that I have delayed after expressing what I had to, a general willingness to cooperate.

On another subject, I am certain that aside from other violations of my rights of which I have proofs in my possession, I am certain that the CIA intercepted my mail. The one exception in my correspondence with eastern Europe to the purpose being the pursuit of my first-amendment rights is a letter I wrote at the suggestion of the USIA. I know my mail to England was interfered with and I do suspect the CIA, whose behavior

since I started asking it questions kore than four years ago is consistent with guilt. I can think of this one exception to all my European correspondence having to do with publoshing what I have written. If these interceptions included Italy and there can be proof developed it will show that I would not accept the late (radical millionaire) Giangiacomo Feltrinelli's proposal that I make a swashbuckling attack on the government, especially the FBI and CIA, when he offered to publish this kind of book.

So, can you check to see if you have come accross any evidence of these interceptions in the course of the committee's work or can the CIA be asked? They have been stonewalling me for many months and I will be writing them again soon.

They do have an unexposed "front" for a special kind of surveillance on citizens in the pursuit of first-amendment rights. I have proofs in my possession. Aside from this I have what I believe is substantial reason to believe there were other, similar operations your committee has shown no signs of knowing about.

When I can, if I have no alternative, I will be taking this to court. If there is no problem involved for you I would appreciate any help you can provide on this. However, I do think that any federal intrusion into the capability of a writer to publish whatever he may want to ought not be of any interest to any federal agency. Mac suspected this when I did not. Ten years ago.

If Mac is not going to be able to find time before I will have to make decisions I would like to know.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg